

REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1–42, 44–76, and 78 were previously pending and under consideration.

Claims 17, 35, 53, and 55–72 are cancelled herein.

Therefore, claims 1–16, 18–34, 36–42, 44–52, 54, 73–76, and 78 are now pending, under consideration, and stand rejected.

Claims 1–8, 10–16, 18–34, 36–42, 44–52, 54, 73–76, and 78 are amended herein.

No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Interview of 14 March 2007. At the Interview Applicant explained what type of directory the invention pertains to, namely, as now reflected in various of the claims, a directory comprises a network-based directory service providing storage and lookup of objects corresponding to resources. The Examiner requested clarification of workflow. Some of the claims are amended herein to recite that a workflow may comprise stored information defining a plurality of tasks and flow between the tasks.

The current rejection compares a "directory" in the claims with column 117, lines 24–37 of Bowman–Amuah. This portion of Bowman–Amuah discusses a file system directory, that is, the type of directory that is used to organize files in a file system. This type of directory differs significantly from the type of directory recited in the present claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The clarification of "directory" in the present independent claims should not be

Type of Response: Amendment

Application Number: 09/995,004

Attorney Docket Number: MS1–772US/154742.01

Filing Date: November 26, 2001

PATENT

construed as a narrowing of the scope of the claims, as the term "directory", when read in light of the specification, clearly does not refer to a file system type of directory. The clarification of "directory" in the claims only makes explicit various aspects of a directory that are subsumed by the term "directory".

Other amendments made herein either broaden the claims or place them in a form consistent with the amended independent claims.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the present application is requested. Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/995,004
Attorney Docket Number: MS1-772US/154742.01
Filing Date: November 26, 2001

PATENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: 3 May 2007

By: /James T. Strom/

James T. Strom, Reg. No.: 48,702
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone: (425) 706-0362
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

May 3, 2007
Date

/ Noemi Tovar /
Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/995,004
Attorney Docket Number: MS1-772US/154742.01
Filing Date: November 26, 2001